

REMARKS

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's determination that claims 20-25 and 29 are allowable. These claims were objected to as depending on rejected claims. These claims have been rewritten in independent format to overcome the objection.

The subject matter of claim 9 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claims 2 and 9 have been cancelled.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his consideration of the arguments presented in the Reply filed 26 July 2004, and withdrawal of the previous grounds for rejection. The present Office Action presents different reasons for rejection of the claims, based on teaching in the Ramesh patent of a second layer of certain polyamides and the passage in column 15, lines 10-27. Applicant has considered these particular points and replies to them with regard to the amended claims.

Rejections Under 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, and 5-8 have been rejected as unpatentable over the Ramesh patent, U.S. Patent 6,274,228.

Claim 3 has been rejected as unpatentable over the Ramesh patent, U.S. Patent 6,274,228, in view of the Wang patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,124,007.

Claims 4,16-19, and 26-28 have been rejected as unpatentable over the Ramesh patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,274,228, in view of the Bonk patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,082,025.

Claims 10-15 have been rejected as unpatentable over the Ramesh patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,274,228, in view of the Bonk patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,082,025, and the Wang patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,124,007.

Claim 9 has been rejected as unpatentable over the Ramesh patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,274,228, in view of page 1234 of the *Concise Encyclopedia of Polymer Science and Engineering* [“the Encyclopedia”].

Applicant respectfully traverses each of these rejections with respect to the amended claims and requests reconsideration of the claims for the following reasons.

The Examiner has agreed that Ramesh et al. do not teach an annealing temperature of 200 degrees C, but argues that Ramesh does teach annealing at about 100 degrees C in column 15, lines 10-27. Office Action, page 3. The Examiner also asserts certain glass transition temperatures for polyamides mentioned in the Ramesh patent on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that these assertions be supported by appropriate evidence if the rejection is repeated pursuant to MPEP 2142. But, even accepting the values for the sake of argument, the greatest difference advanced by the Office Action in this argument is significantly short of the at least about 80°C difference now in claim 1.


The rejection of former claim 9 is based on a supposed annealing temperature of 200 degrees C. The argument advanced in paragraph 8 of the Office Action, however, does not square with the Examiner’s recognition that Ramesh only teaches annealing at about 100 degrees C (see page 3 of the Office Action). Thus, Applicant believes that claim 1 and its dependent claims as amended now overcome the rejections.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims as amended.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the rejections of the final Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if it would be helpful for resolving any issue or would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,


Anna M. Budde
Registration No. 35,085

April 18, 2005
Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600